with a face mask, said adaptor having an adjustable one way valve, which allows air to flow into said mask, but prevents air to flow back into said anesthesia circuit, said small tube containing an adjustable one way valve, which allows air to flow into said balloon or inflatable toy, and prevents air to flow back to said adaptor; whereby a child can continually inflate said balloon or inflatable toy during said inhalation induction.

Remarks-General

By the above amendment, the applicant have rewritten all claims to define the invention more particularly and distinctly so as to overcome the technical rejections and define the invention patentably over the prior art.

1. About the criticism of drawings

The application was electronically filed by using US Patent and Trademark Office Electronic Filing System 4.0 software. The applicant didn't know that the drawings are small in size when they were printed out in the patent office. To overcome this, the applicant sends the drawings of original size with this letter.

2. Claim 1-2 & 1/4 rejections-35 USC 102

This application has several distinct differences from the device of Butler et al (US 5865172):

a. **Butler's device is not prepared to connect with an anesthesia or respiratory circuit.** According to the Description, the device or fluid conduit (10) has the first end (11) connected to a source of fluid pharmacological agent and the second end (12) coupled to a face mask. However, the device of this application is prepared and capable of connecting to an anesthesia or a respiratory circuit, but not a source of fluid agent.

b. **The check valve (30) in Butler's device is for producing a same direction rotation of the stimulator (14).** Butler's flow control device comprises an inhalation port (34), an exhalation port (32) and a valve (30) to direct air passing blades (19) and producing rotation of the stimulator (14). The valve (30) is unable to close and is not adjustable. In contrast, the one way valves of this application can be in both open and closed status and are adjustable. When a child breaths with the mask, the one way valves allow air to inflate a balloon, but not to produce rotation of a stimulator.

c. **In Butler's device, the connection between the fluid conduit (10) and the toy (14) is a rotatable turbine (15).** Only FIG. 5 shows a tube connection. But this tube has no control valve inside. In the present application, the mask and the toy are connected by a tube, which contains an adjustable one way valve to control air flow.

d. **The t y or visual stimulat r (14) in Butler's device is not inflatable or continually inflatable.** The sensory stimulator (14) in most embodiments is rotatable rather than inflatable. Only FIG. 5 shows an inflatable-deflatable toy (14). But this toy (14) can not be inflated continually due to lack of valve to control air flow. In the present application, a balloon or an inflatable toy can be inflated continually to certain size for visual stimulation since air flow is controlled by one way valves.

Accordingly, Butler's device has distinct differences in structures and function from this application.

3. Claim 3 & 3/4 rejections-35 USC 102

This application has several distinct differences from the device of Watt (US 6578571):

a. **The toy (20) in Watt's device is not inflatable.** The toy in all embodiments is mounted in a colored spinning disc (20) contained within a transparent orb (36). Thus the toy (20) and the orb (36) both are not inflatable. In contrast, a balloon or an inflatable toy in the present application can be inflated continually to certain size for visual stimulation since air flow is controlled by one way valves.

b. **Watt's device is designed for delivering drugs with MDI.** Watt's device contains a rectangle-shaped receiving means (8) and a drug delivery device or MDI (48). However, these designs are not presented in this application.

c. **Watt's device contains an inhalation-driven toy unit (12) or portals (38) for air entering.** The toy unit (12) connects to a three-way conduit of a separator element (10) and allows air to pass into the separator element (10) to mix with drugs. Portals (38) have a similar function for air entering. However, these designs are not presented in this application since an air entering portal is unnecessary.

Accordingly, Watt's device has distinct differences in structures and function from this application.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, the applicant submits the specification and claims now in proper form, and the claims all define patentably over the prior art.

Conditional Request for Constructive Assistance

The applicant has amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, the applicant respectfully request the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P.

2173.02 and 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very respectfully,

Henry H. Zhou